



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

42

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/923,809	08/07/2001	Stephane Kasriel	155.1006.01	9660
22854	7590	04/12/2005	EXAMINER	
MOORE, HANSEN & SUMNER, PLLP 225 SOUTH SIXTH ST MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402			BATAILLE, PIERRE MICHE	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2186	

DATE MAILED: 04/12/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/923,809	KASRIEL ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Pierre-Michel Bataille	2186	

**All Participants:**

(1) Pierre-Michel Bataille.

(2) Shawn B. Dempster.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 4 April 2005

**Time:** 11:00 AM

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

**Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

**Rejection(s) discussed:**

*Final-Rejection dated 01/04/05*

**Claims discussed:**

1

**Prior art documents discussed:**

*US 6,405,252 (Gupta et al) and US 6,343,318 (Hawkins et al)*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*See Continuation Sheet*

**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant argued that neither reference teaches the features of the claims, as the claims are directed to "WEB pages containing set of compressed information comprising static elements of the WEB page and a set of dynamic elements".

Applicant admitted, however, that Gupta discloses static information and a set of dynamic information related to a WEB page, but fails to specify COMPRESSED static information.

The examiner contended that the claimed compressed static information is nothing but "persistent data such as hyperlinks, graphics, and text that typically do not change between web page accesses" as disclosed in applicant's disclosure and as taught by Gupta (Col. 9, Lines 35-38).

The examiner contended that Hawkins, moreover, provides the deficient feature of compressed information as Hawkins discloses "compressed markup language representing a compressed description of information to be displayed on the screen" and such "static information is stored locally on wireless communication devices, as the static information does not change significantly over time" (Col. 9, Lines 15-2, Lines 48-50).

It was finally agreed that the language of the claims should be altered to remove the references from reading upon the claims..